APPENDIX I

Vol. 34, No. 32 August 8, 1975

CONTINUING REPORTS ON THE 94TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION
San Francisco, Calif., June 29-July 5, 1975

ACRL/ACADEMIC STATUS COMMITTEE
Preconference Institute on Collective Bargaining in Higher Education: Its Implications for Governance and Faculty Status for Librarians

Slightly more than 150 persons preregistered for the institute which began with registration and a reception on Thursday afternoon, June 26. The registrants included academic librarians from public and private universities and colleges throughout the country. There was a large number of administrators in the group as well as a wide range of experience in collective bargaining. One of the discussion tables at the reception included librarians from a large private university with no collective bargaining, a state university just entering into its first election campaign phase, and a university already several years into the bargaining process with an exclusive bargaining agent, and a university librarian seeking only general information on the whole process.

This informal beginning brought out a wide range of interest and concerns: the benefits of union as opposed to professional association membership for librarians; an acceptance that unions are here to stay with a concern about how to deal with this new inevitability; a clear interest in assuring professional staff interests and integrity in a collective bargaining situation; and a recognition that professional librarians must be involved, especially before a union election, to assure that their interests are well known and represented.

Those in management already involved with unions spoke of the significant time spent on the bargaining process. Those on the union side talked of the educational value of working in the process and of the heightened sense of accountability. Those concerned about the adversary nature of collective bargaining were answered by those advocating active staff involvement in the union to assure that their interests and not those of union professionals predominated.

John Haak, University of California, San Diego, presiding over the first General Session on Friday morning, suggested that we might be "hobbits entering a murky forest" as we prepare to pinpoint the issues and equip ourselves to deal with the day-to-day problems found in academic collective bargaining. One participant's hindsight would indicate that the sturdy qualities of hobbits are definitely required and that if collective bargaining is not exactly a murky forest, neither is it a clear scene. What is very clear is that generalizations are difficult at best. Each state's enabling legislation is different in some respect. Each contract resulting from collective bargaining is different in some aspect, reflecting the nature of the academic institution, the activity of the faculty and library staff in university governance, the relationship between faculty and administration, and so forth.

In his introductory remarks, C. James Schmidt, chairman of ACRL's Academic Status Committee, explained that because collective bargaining had been too large an issue to handle at the 1974 ACRL program, this preconference had been scheduled. He identified four key issues: the problem of jurisdiction (who is under collective bargaining); bargaining unit definition (who is in the unit, who is out, who is a supervisor); choice of bargaining agent (union); and the consequences of collective bargaining on the organizational structure of the library, on patterns of service, and on the "inevitable fiscal crunch into which higher education is moving."

Donald Wollett, the principal speaker who is Director of Employee Relations, State of New York, compared university systems of governance with collective bargaining, focusing on areas of conflict and discussing the choices between the two systems. He stressed that governance (faculty participation in governing university affairs) does nothing for the nonparticipant. Collective bargaining units do more and are more democratic; however, minorities (that is, librarians) may suffer from majority (that is, faculty) domination. While faculty senates are generally ineffective to deal with control by outside governing boards, academic unions do not have great track records either, partly because of a lack of active membership participation. Higher education faculties have not carried their weight, nor have academic unions mounted a credible "interruption" threat. Governance as a system is harder to bring to account than collective bargaining (union) management. A choice between the two systems can be avoided by selecting neither or by creating a collective bargaining contract

which allows continuing governance through a faculty senate.

Kenneth Mortimer of Pennsylvania State University presented a survey of experience in academic collective bargaining. Mortimer stressed that collective bargaining was a phenomenon of educational institutions in the public sector with 255 bargaining units on 385 campuses, 80 percent of which are publicly supported. As mentioned earlier, state laws vary, rarely recognizing academic faculty specifically. The scope of contracts varies widely. Twenty-five percent of four-year institution contracts do provide for faculty senate activity as long as there is no overlap with the contract. There is coexistence between faculty senates and unions but always tension. Much depends on the activity of the administration and its preference for senate participation. There is concern that the faculty senate may atrophy under collective bargaining. But there is also evidence that union competition may be spurring senate activity. In addition there is an indication that unions may exploit faculty senates to gain what the contract does not allow. Student activity in collective bargaining ranges from observers (CUNY) through coalition with faculty or management to a tripartite relationship where they ratify those parts of contracts involving them. The scope of bargaining in higher education covers salaries, grievance procedures, union rights and privileges (for example, office space, bulletin boards, release time), terms and conditions of employment and governance items (selection of presidents, deans, senate members, and so forth). Mortimer described the questions raised in unit determination, that is, what part of the university will be in the bargaining unit and represented by the union, as the geographic issue–should all campuses in a multi-campus university be included; who is management, who is labor; are part-time employees included or excluded; are professional schools (law schools, medical schools) in or out of the unit. Professional schools have been successful in making a case for their unique situations.

General Session II on Friday afternoon gave representatives of three unions active in higher education and two other points of view an opportunity to present their positions on the issues. Dirck Brown of the National Education Association (NEA) asked the group to "shed its romanticism" and "organize for power." Charles J. McClain of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) pointed out that "librarians have been meek" in taking advantage of collective bargaining prerogatives and contract rights. He believed that the more librarians act like faculty–or, assertively–the sooner they will be accorded faculty status. Warren L. Kessler of the University of California at Fresno, President of United Professors of California, an affiliate of the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), stated that one cannot generalize about the appropriateness of collective bargaining. One has to look at the institution in which he works in terms of past practices, faculty activity in governance and so forth. He feels it is professional to be in a union and urged the election of an experienced, professional union for effective collective bargaining. David Feller, representing the Berkeley Faculty Association at the University of California, Berkeley, emphasized his group's concern that university governance be preserved while recognizing that faculty is primarily interested in academics, not especially in the functions of senates which are chores to be endured. The Berkeley group is looking into legislation which would enable a mutually advantageous combination of collective bargaining and faculty governance. Daniel Orr, Professor of Economics at University of California, San Diego, spoke against academic unions, questioning the accomplishments of unions in general and pointing out that unions do better in growth industries–higher education at this point not particularly falling into the growth industry category!

During the question period which followed, there was some concern whether librarians should be included in faculty bargaining units or pursue their goals separately. Mr. Kessler felt that if librarians make a case that they are uniquely different as a group, they may find themselves "shoved into a clerical/nonprofessional bargaining unit." Several speakers questioned whether librarians as a separate group were large enough to have much clout in a particular academic institution.

Saturday morning at General Session III, Jean Kennelly, Assistant Professor of Librarianship at University of Washington, presented a survey, "Current Status of Academic Librarians Involved in Collective Bargaining." The general results of the survey indicated that librarians are *included* in the faculty bargaining units in those institutions selected for study (19 out of 130 four-years institutions involved in collective bargaining nationwide). Library administrators are included in one-third of the units, but excluded in the majority. Asked whether collective bargaining had appeared to cause change, most responded "no changes"; however, in one-half of those libraries surveyed the professional library staff already had fac-

ulty status prior to collective bargaining. The speaker proposed, as a general conclusion, that because of outside hostility, we are entering an era when we need collective bargaining protection.

Group sessions followed, led by librarians experienced in the collective bargaining process at various institutions. The participants had an opportunity to learn about specific situations and ask questions. This writer attended one led by Lothar Spang of Wayne State University where AAUP represents faculty and staff in one unit. Spang felt that the faculty and librarians found collective bargaining had become an acceptable, businesslike process. Bargaining over the contract, however, had been a long, time-consuming process in which thorough preparation and communication within the bargaining unit was a critical factor for success in drawing up an acceptable, workable contract.

Gwendolyn Cruzat, University of Michigan, presented a paper, "Issues and Strategies for Academic Librarians" at General Session IV. She launched a review of enabling legislation, positions of various unions, the nature of institutions involved in bargaining, composition of the bargaining unit and faculty status for librarians with the observation that the more one knows about collective bargaining, the more one is disinclined to generalize. She felt that librarians must be active to assure they are in a position of influence. She held that AAUP, AFT, and NEA attitudes on the composition of the bargaining unit vary according to union locals. She described those organizations as extremely opportunistic. One organization's decline in membership caused its endorsement of faculty status for librarians. But faculties are resistant in part to their inclusion because they do not perceive librarians as faculty.

Kenneth Mortimer summed up the two-day institute by outlining what the process of collective bargaining included: how the unit is determined, elections, negotiating contracts, and the administration of agreements. He described governance as shared authority, "a system of interaction." Collective bargaining can mandate such shared authority. He described the background and nature of the institution as the key consideration. If there is little governance, then collective bargaining becomes a constitutional convention to develop the missing governance system. Mr. Mortimer encouraged librarians to codify their collective experience in bargaining. He felt librarians should not "go it alone"; the realities of a very political environment must be faced. Librarians should look at potential faculty alliances. He warned that unions can be dominated by a minority of dues-paying members and urged an active majority to prevent such a possibility. In evaluating potential unions, librarians should look with care at the individuals in the union local not the national organization policy or personalities. The speaker complimented the program committee's choice of materials mailed in advance to the participants, indicating that the answers were "there to be read." (The orientation packet was provided by Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service, 1818 R St. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009).

[*David G. Remington*]

CATALOG CODE REVISION COMMITTEE

The RTSD Catalog Code Revision Committee began its summer 1975 meeting on Thursday evening, June 26, just before the opening of the ALA Annual Conference. The first session was devoted to internal business (approval of minutes, distribution of documentation, and so forth) and reports by John Byrum, chairman of CCRC, and representatives from the Library of Congress, the Canadian Committee on Cataloguing, and the Descriptive Cataloging Committee of ALA. Mr. Byrum included in his report news of the Joint Steering Committee and informed the CCRC membership that it had been decided that rule revision proposals dealing with music, law, and incunabula will go directly to the Joint Steering Committee bypassing the three national committees for rule revision. The Library of Congress also reported on the production of camera-ready copy for the new Chapter 12 separate to be published this summer or early fall.

The Friday morning session was devoted to the separate meetings of various rule revision teams charged with responsibility for reviewing specific areas in the rules. The remainder of the sessions on Friday, Saturday, Monday, and Tuesday were devoted to reports by the rule revision teams. Some of the major topics covered were corporate authorship, corporate headings, religious headings, the rules for description, and the rules for personal names. Part of one session was also devoted to unresolved matters left over from the spring meeting which concern the pre-second edition revisions in Chapter 14. Perhaps of greatest interest was the time devoted to serial entry at Tuesday's concluding sessions.

At that time, both the concept of authorship as it is related to serials and the rules for entry of serials were discussed. After a report by the subcommittee organized to investigate the area of authorship, the

committee decided that a statement of the problem of corporate authorship be drafted and that the editors of the revised *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules* be requested to address this area at the earliest opportunity.

The revision team responsible for evaluating the rules for entry of serials also presented a summary of various alternatives to the existing rules. Two approaches emerged from this discussion for serious consideration: the elimination of a separate rule for entry of serials, assuming a general rule based upon a well-defined concept of authorship, and title main entry for all serials. Based largely upon the diffuse authorship of most serials and the difficulties inherent in determining this, the committee voted to request the editors of the revised AACR to implement a rule specifying the entry of all serials under title.

[*Mary Sauer and Ben Tucker*]

MARBI COMMITTEE

The RTSD/ISAD/RASD Representation in Machine-Readable Form of Bibliographic Information (MARBI) Committee met on June 28, July 1, and July 2, for a total of nine hours.

Henriette Avram reported on developments concerning subject headings and name authority records, Library of Congress distribution of Canadian MARC records, and COMARC and related projects.

In response to an invitation from the RTSD Catalog Code Revision Committee that MARBI point out any machine considerations with respects to matters under consideration by CCRC, it was decided (1) that John Knapp, MARBI liaison to CCRC, would assume a more active role and (2) that Helen Schmierer, who already attends CCRC as official representative of the Library Research Round Table, would serve as on-the-spot resource person to CCRC and refer to MARBI matters which may have implications for machine processing.

MARBI members are to send any comments with respect to machine implications for AACR revision to John Knapp by August 1.

The committee expressed the desirability of developing a standard set of media designator terms for AACR, but did not endorse the terms or codes in the fourth edition of the AECT Standards for Cataloging Nonprint Material. Once such a set of terms is developed, MARBI would be interested in adopting or in assisting in the development of a new code that would not be based on the English language and that would be consistent with any international code.

The committee also expressed the opinion that while the fullness of entry is basically a cataloging and not a machine consideration, machine records need not be limited by the space limitations of manual records and hierarchical headings are preferable for logical manipulation by the machine and provide more information to be retrieved.

In response to an expression of interest by the MARBI committee, Mrs. Avram stated that the Library of Congress will publish its generalized MARC format.

Mrs. Avram described how the MARC International Format came into being, the plans for its review in an open meeting of the IFLA Working Group on Content Designation in Paris in October, and its anticipated use among national agencies without impacting existing national formats. Since support of the international format by divisions of ALA which MARBI represents would strengthen the U.S. position, MARBI will seek divisional support to send a representative to the Paris meeting. Members of the committee will submit any comments on the format to Mrs. Avram and to the incoming MARBI chairman, Charles Payne, before September.

Responses by the committee on the authority format, especially with respect to subject authorities, are to be submitted to the chairman by August 1, since the Library of Congress expects to initiate a subject headings distribution service in 1976.

Richard Anable reported that the first meeting of the ANSI Z39 Subcommittee 40 on Serials Holdings Statements was largely organizational. The subcommittee will be concerned with defining the data element content of holdings records, with emphasis on national or regional union lists, rather than with content designation of these elements in a machine-readable record. MARBI requested that it be sent copies of the minutes of the subcommittee.

Three additional changes to the serials format were discussed. The addition of a variable field 212 for an Expanded Title field required for ISDS, and of a subfield "a" to the Collation field will be submitted for comment by MARC users. The third proposed change, which would allow for the inclusion of both ALA and AACR headings in the record pending development of the name authority system, will be further studied by the Library of Congress and reported back to MARBI. [*Josephine S. Pulsifer*]

GODORT STATE DOCUMENTS TASK FORCE

The State Documents Task Force of the Government Documents Round Table (GODORT) held its principal meeting on June 30, with the Task Force

Coordinator, Stanley Adams, of the Illinois State Library, Springfield, and Bernard Fry, Dean of the Indiana University Library School, Bloomington, sharing the moderator's chair. A panel discussion on the question "Anglo-Am or Am Not?" reflected GODORT's position that the *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules* (AACR) deal inadequately with entry problems for documents, including those published at the state level. Elizabeth Tate, Chief of the Library of Congress Descriptive Cataloging Division, began with a summary of the Library's overall processing operations and provided a brief description of the functions of the State Documents Section of the Exchange and Gift Division. While calling attention to some of the complexities inherent in the cataloging of documents because of the nature of the corporate names, Mrs. Tate came down firmly for AACR, stating that the remedy does not lie in drafting special rules for documents but in refining the present ones to make them more effective. Next, Richard Nichols, California State Publications Librarian, Sacramento, discussed cataloging of California official publications by the State Library. Two primary considerations guide the State Library in its procedures: (1) expediency and (2) awareness of the state government's organization and publishing activities. Mr. Nichols commented that his institution does not adhere strictly to AACR but takes elements of both the AA rules and the fomer ALA rules. Frances Hinton of the Free Library, Philadelphia, serving as one of the team leaders for the rules revision process of RTSD's Catalog Code Revision Committee, was the final panel speaker. She provided background information on the rules review and revision process, emphasizing that the primary purpose is to reconcile the differences between the American and British texts. Discussing the 1961 Paris Principles (for cataloging) and the concept of corporate authors, she pointed out that librarians outside the United States still have a more restricted view of corporate authors than Americans. She emphasized that the rules must be accepted internationally and therefore compromises will be necessary. Following Miss Hinton's remarks, the panelists answered questions from the attendees. Both the number and intensity of the inquiries and comments showed that specialists in state documents and documents librarians generally are not only dissatisfied with the present rules for handling documents but also very concerned about the outcome of the rules revision work.

[*Marcie Rickun and Robert W. Schaaf*]

RSBRC OMNIBUS SUBCOMMITTEE

The meeting of the Omnibus Subcommittee of the Reference and Subscription Books Review Committee was called to order by Chairwoman Nancy Gwinn on Monday, June 30 in the San Francisco Civic Auditorium. Richard S. Halsey of the State University of New York reported on the encyclopedia omnibus review project currently underway. He will include 22 encyclopedias in the review, which should be submitted to members of the RSBRC by December for publication in early 1976. In the review process he will be assisted by approximately 50 assistant reviewers drawn from libraries, schools, and universities in New York State.

The subcommittee also developed preliminary plans for an omnibus review of college-level dictionaries. The article will be assigned before the Midwinter Meeting and a proposal from the assignee will be submitted to the subcommittee for consideration at that conference. A notice to publishers of college-level dictionaries will be printed in the September issue of *Booklist*.

Before closing the meeting, other ideas for future omnibus reviews were discussed. [*Nancy E. Gwinn*]

REFERENCE AND SUBSCRIPTION BOOKS REVIEW COMMITTEE

Two meetings of the Reference and Subscription Books Review Committee were held on June 30 and July 1. Chairman Jeanette Swickard reported that the committee will sponsor a program in Chicago at the 1976 annual conference entitled "The Making of a General Encyclopedia." So far, five major encyclopedia companies have agreed to provide speakers, including the Encyclopedia Britannica, Field Enterprises, Grolier, Macmillan, and the New Columbia Encyclopedia.

In other action, the committee voted to dedicate the next issue of reprints of committee reviews as a memorial for recently deceased member, Thomas S. Shaw. A page will be added to the volume enumerating his contributions to the committee.

The remarkable production of the committee over the past year was noted. From September 1974 to July 1975, 303 reviews and notes were published, as compared with 246 for the previous year. In the July 15 issue of *Booklist* alone, 62 reviews and notes are scheduled to appear. Five years ago, only 23 reviews were published during the entire year. Outgoing chairman Mrs. Swickard congratulated the committee on its magnificent efforts and introduced the new chairman, Richard S. Halsey, Associate Professor, State University of New York, School of Library Science.

[*Nancy E. Gwinn*]

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE

The ALA International Relations Committee (IRC) met on June 30, and sponsored an open meeting on "The International Dimensions of ALA" on July 1. The principal topics discussed were the reestablishment of an ALA International Relations Office, which will take place in the autumn of 1975, and the need to develop a coherent and well-focused ALA international relations policy.

Chairman Norman Horrocks announced that the reestablishment of an International Relations Office within ALA headquarters was in response to the recommendations of both the IRC and a January 25, 1974, report to the ALA Council by an Ad Hoc Committee to Study ALA International Relations Responsibilities. The IRC budget for fiscal 1976 includes the salary of the new international relations coordinator.

Other committee business at the June 30 meeting included consideration and approval of a resolution, sponsored jointly with the Intellectual Freedom Committee, protesting the treatment of librarian Maria Luz Fernandez Alvarez and her colleagues by Spanish authorities; presentation of reports by Robert D. Stevens, chairman of the IRC Advisory Committee on Liaison with Japanese Libraries, by Theodore Waller, the U.S. member of the International Book Committee, and by Esther J. Walls, ALA representative to the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO; and consideration of several nominees to represent ALA in its dealings with other organizations concerned with international matters.

RTSD RS EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The RTSD Resources Section Executive Committee met in two 4:30 p.m. sessions chaired by this writer on Monday, June 30, and on Wednesday, July 2. At the first session, following approval of the minutes of the Chicago Midwinter Meeting, Hans Weber of the University of California, Riverside, reported on the meeting earlier that day of the Acquisition of Library Materials Discussion Group that was attended by approximately 50 librarians. Representatives from several wholesalers, bookdealers, and micropublishers had been invited to discuss "approval plans" and how to communicate most effectively information about their products and services to librarians. The newly elected officers of this informal group are Jane Maddox of the University of Tennessee, Chairman, and Claude Noyes of the University of Rochester Vice Chairman/Chairman-elect.

J. Michael Bruer of the University of Houston reported on the meeting the previous afternoon of the Collection Development Officers of Medium-Sized Research Libraries Discussion Group that was attended by approximately 40 librarians. Topics discussed included the organizational patterns for collection development staff, procedures for appraisals of library materials, the cancellation of serial subscriptions, and the Center for Research Libraries policies regarding collecting and lending materials. David Zubatsky of Washington University was elected new chairman of this group. It was reported that the Collection Development Officers of Large-Sized Research Libraries Discussion Group desires to affiliate with the Resources Section also.

The proposed Acquisitions Scholarship Award application was approved by Council later in the week and it should be possible to announce the first recipient at the Annual Conference in Chicago in 1976. The Policy and Research Committee of the Resources Section performed a review of the library literature for 1973 and 1974 in preparation for serving as a jury for this award. The 1974 and 1975 literature will serve as the basis for the jury's recommendation for the initial award to be made to the author of a significant monograph or journal article in the field of acquisitions by college or university libraries who in turn will designate the library school to receive funds for a scholarship.

The proposed publication of a leaflet entitled "What Shall I Do With My Old Books," written by Shirley Lebo of the Library of Congress, was enthusiastically endorsed. The draft of this flyer is presently being reviewed by appropriate units of ALA and publication by ALA early in 1976 is planned. The progress of ANSI Committee Z-39 Subcommittee 36 chaired by Jennifer Magnus of the Library of Congress in producing a draft standard library book order form was applauded. The use of this form when it is adopted as an ANSI standard, together with the use of the International Standard Book Number and the Standard Account Number by libraries in ordering materials represent significant advances in communication and in efficiency in acquisitions work.

Murray S. Martin of Pennsylvania State University, Chairman of the Resources Section for 1975-1976, reported on plans for a Sunday meeting from 10 a.m. to 6 p.m. at the Annual Conference in Chicago next year to be co-sponsored with other ALA units with the general theme of "The International Flow of Books." The 10 a.m. to noon program is to discuss world book publishing and distribution with emphasis on international bibliographical control; the 2 to 4

p.m. program is to consist of concurrent meetings on book production in particular areas, such as the United States, Europe, Asia, Latin America, Africa, and other English-language areas; the 4:30 to 6 p.m. time slot is to present one or more major speakers to review the general topic from the author's and publisher's point of view and to summarize any recommendations or proposals for action made during the day.

The second session of the Resources Section Executive Committee was devoted primarily to reports on activities since meetings of the six major committees last winter. Murray S. Martin of Pennsylvania State University, the incoming Chairman of the Resources Section, reported on the successful luncheon meeting of the Executive Committee held on Monday, June 30, to facilitate communication and expedite the work of the section. This enjoyable practice will be continued. Lawrence S. Robinson of the Library of Congress, Chairman of the Micropublishing Projects Committee, is reporting separately on the two meetings held on Monday, June 30, the latter held jointly with the Standards Committee of the Reproduction of Library Materials Section.

Juanita Doares of the New York Public Library, Chairman of the Collection Development Committee, described the very well-attended and highly successful meetings held all day on Tuesday, July 1, that were cosponsored with the RTSD/AAP Joint Committee. These meetings on "Book Marketing and Selection: A Publishing-Library Forum" and "Selection Merry-Go-Round" are also being reported separately.

A preliminary report of the findings of the four task forces that labored throughout the past year to assemble data for the Book Marketing and Selection Program is contained in the June 16 issue of *Publishers Weekly*. A meeting to plan the action required to follow up on recommendations generated at this program has already been scheduled in New York in early August. A final report will be published to summarize the results of the work of this dynamic group of publishers representatives and librarians.

The very successful "West Coast Publishing" program on Thursday afternoon, July 3, also cosponsored by the Resources Section with the RTSD/AAP Joint Committee, is also being reported on separately. A *Directory of Western Book Publishers* was distributed at this program and a list of booksellers that are members of the Northern California chapter of the Antiquarian Booksellers Association of America was available at the ALA Tour Desk for those librarians that desired to visit bookstores in the Bay Area.

The activities of the Bookdealer-Library Relations, Reprinting, Library Materials Price Index, and Policy and Research Committees of the Resources Section were reviewed by their respective chairmen, Harriet K. Rebuldela of the University of Colorado, Henry James of Sweet Briar College, Paul Birkel of the University of San Francisco and Deanna Marcum of the Joint University Libraries. Accounts of the meetings of these four committees are also being reported separately. Connie Dunlap of Duke University described the proposed Annual Conference program on children's books planned for next year to be sponsored by the RTSD/AAP Joint Committee in cooperation with other units of ALA. The meeting concluded with congratulations to Abigail Dahl-Hansen of the University of California, Riverside, and Jean Boyer of Temple University on their election as Vice Chairman/Chairman-elect and Member-at-Large of the Resources Section respectively, and with this writer's expression of appreciation to the Executive Committee members and committee chairmen for their fine cooperation during the past year. The two meetings reflected ample evidence of the significant progress made by the Resources Section during the past year, the second year of activity after the authorization of its expanded role as the Resources rather than Acquisitions Section. [*Robert C. Sullivan*]

RASD COOPERATIVE REFERENCE SERVICES COMMITTEE

Both successful and unsuccessful aspects of establishing cooperative reference networks were explored at the program meeting "Networks of Knowledge: Model Reference Cooperatives," sponsored by the Cooperative Reference Services Committee of the Reference and Adult Services Division of ALA on July 1 at 10 a.m. Three speakers reported on efforts in San Francisco, Houston and Minneapolis/St. Paul.

Sue Critchfield of the Bay Area Reference Center (BARC) spoke of the Federally funded program initiated by the San Francisco Public Library in 1967. The 10 librarians, two library technicians and accountant who make up the BARC staff cooperate in answering reference queries from many northern California libraries. The questions come in mainly by teletype, but also by mail (BARC discourages telephone inquiries). Extensive reference files have been built and a subject request form devised to facilitate communication problems. BARC librarians also engage in personal contact liaison by frequently visiting member libraries, attending their staff meetings, etc.

The Bay Area Reference Center gives workshops

quarterly for member libraries on such topics as current awareness (for example, trends in education), how to do legal research, problems with census data, and so forth. "Mini-Workshops" are also presented, tailored to individual needs of member libraries. In addition, BARC publishes several items, including *BARC Notes*, a list updating names and dates in standard reference sources, a union list of auto repair books, and papers on other specialized topics.

Rita Paddock, currently with the Harvard College Library, reported on her previous work with the Regional Information and Communication Exchange project at Rice University in Houston. From its beginning in 1967, the Exchange has sought to provide reference service to business, college, and university libraries along the Texas Gulf Coast. RICE handles scientific, business and technical questions, and also provides literature searching. Unlike BARC, RICE has started charging for its services and is now providing hourly rates.

The Regional Information and Communication Exchange has had only limited success, according to Miss Paddock. Initial marketing of its services was a failure for a number of reasons, among which were that people were not used to paying for library service, librarians in other institutions did not want to forward questions, and RICE lacked adequate dedicated staff and expense money. The project was more successful with local company libraries and institutions, but even here, success seemed to depend on the person with whom you were dealing, whether researcher or secretary. While Miss Paddock left Rice University some time ago, she reported that use of the network has increased with the installation of several computer retrieval systems in scientific areas.

Two more successful cooperative efforts were described by Carol Vantine, Minneapolis Public Library, who is a staff member of INFORM (Information for Minnesota). The Minneapolis Public Library is involved in two networks. The first, MLSA (Metropolitan Library Service Agency) arose out of the Goldhor study in 1967. It services counties around Minneapolis and St. Paul and consists of both interlibrary loan with truck delivery and an informal back-up reference service. Since the metropolitan area is so small, however, there are no toll telephone charges and so most questions seem to be telephoned directly to the Minneapolis or St. Paul libraries by the patron rather than going through official channels. MLSA is supposed to reimburse the libraries for this service, but since the patron is seldom queried as to where he is calling from, the Minneapolis Public Library never asks for reimbursement.

The second service, INFORM, begin in 1970 as a result of demand from the business community for back-up service. The cooperating libraries were the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis Public Library, St. Paul Public Library, and the James J. Hill Reference Library. It was a fee-based service from the beginning with the fee set at $18 per hour; some of these funds were used for advertising on a cooperative basis, but each library was responsible for overhead and salaries. This particular network ended last fall.

Miss Vantine postulated a number of reasons for the demise of the network. One of the primary reasons was that the administrative staffs of the member libraries were not equally committed to the project. The business community they were supposed to serve needed information quickly; consequently, INFORM staff needed support in the form of dedication, flexible scheduling, freedom of movement, and so forth. Some institutions used INFORM staff for a number of unconnected duties; only Minneapolis Public Library maintained a full-time INFORM staff.

Another problem involved communication between the member institutions. Questions were rarely exchanged, partly because of personalities, partly because of the knowledge of the inadequate time commitment of certain personnel. Even so, INFORM had a terrific response from the business community and was self-sufficient.

Since the majority of questions and funding come from Minneapolis Public, this library continued the service after the coopeative dissolved. In fact, each member institution has some form of it left, but none of the others continued the real commitment of dedicated staff.

INFORM, as now administered by the Minneapolis Public Library, has expanded. The fee was raised to $25 per hour. INFORM staff answer questions from business, industry, academic institutions, and private sources. Most clients, however, are international, multinational corporations with large research staffs. INFORM librarians always deal directly with the original questioner and treat all client requests as confidential, even billing by number alone. Back-up for its own reference department is done without charge.

A question-and-answer period followed the presentations. The program meeting ended and a brief membership meeting of the Reference and Adult Services Division followed. Members staying for this session approved an amendment to the bylaws of the division which would allow for the establishment of discussion groups within the division. Any group of

25 or more members of the division interested in discussing common problems which fall within the purposes of the division may form a discussion group upon written petition from the group to the Committee on Organization and upon approval by the Board of Directors. The full text of the amendment appears in the Winter 1974 issue of *RQ*.

[*Nancy E. Gwinn*]

RTSD/CCS/SUBJECT ANALYSIS COMMITTEE

The Subject Analysis Committee held two meetings on July 1, both of them chaired by Nancy Williamson, University of Toronto Library School, who is being succeeded as chairwoman by Mary Kay DeWees Pietris, Northwestern University Library.

The committee accepted the final report of the Subcommittee on Subject Headings for Correctional Materials as reported in detail in an LC *Information Bulletin* article on the ALA Midwinter Meeting of the committee (March 7, 1975, p. A-67). This stated, in sum, that the corrections field is not precisely defined as to the scope of its activities and interests, that in addition to the Library of Congress and Sears lists of general subject headings, several special vocabularies for subject heading use already exist and should be brought to the attention of interested libraries, but that it would not be worthwhile to attempt to develop a standardized inclusive list of headings for the corrections field.

The committee decided to refrain from further action on the issue of the J. Morris Jones Award for proposals to modify the Library of Congress subject heading and classification systems as submitted by the Slavic and East European Section of ACRL (SEES). Edward Blume, committee liaison with the Library of Congress, reported that the Subject Cataloging Division is maintaining direct contact with the ACRL group and had given it advance copies of new classification developments for Poland and Czechoslovakia; he had also had an opportunity to speak with the executive board of SEES at its first business meeting regarding further communications.

The report on the Dewey Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee, which met at the Library of Congress in April, was given by Clare Ryan, CCS representative to the Dewey committee. She mentioned a survey now being conducted by the Association of Research Libraries on libraries which have reclassified their collections and their reasons for so doing. No firm publication date has been established for Dewey 19. It has been suggested that the editors follow the McGraw-Hill guidelines on eliminating sex discrimination in the introduction. There has been almost no negative response in Great Britain to the new history and area tables for that country. The British expect to have their work done on the music schedule by this fall. Before more work is done on 297 Islam, Benjamin A. Custer will request papers from Pakistan to compare with those already acquired from Iran; a comparison may make it necessary to submit suggestions to both groups for comment. The index to Dewey 19 will follow the same general principles as Dewey 18 and it will be tested immediately after publication. Dewey will be the focus of interest at the Allerton Park Conference on Classification to be held on November 9-10. The Dewey Centennial will be observed in Europe by a seminar cosponsored by the Cataloging and Indexing Group of the British Library Association and the Forest Press.

This writer then reported on the current status of the Library's publication program with regard to both the eighth edition of *Library of Congress Subject Headings* and the revised classification schedules (see the LC *Information Bulletin* for June 20, p. A-104). He also pointed out the major changes recently made or in progress in updating the subject heading system, such as elimination of the Woman/Women dichotomy, the change from Aeroplanes to Airplanes; from Hygiene, Public to Public Health; and from Insurance, Social to Social Security. A suggestion was made and accepted that major changes such as those mentioned above be indicated at the beginning of the supplement in which they first appear since many libraries will try to follow the Library of Congress in changes of this magnitude immediately but do not comb the supplements to identify all changes.

Miss Williamson designated the membership of the newly created Ad Hoc Subcommittee on the Subject Analysis of Audiovisual Materials—Lizbeth Bishoff, Chairwoman, Jessica Harris, Anne Markey, Suzanne Massonneau, David Nevin, David Remington, and Jean Weihs. The subcommittee met in an informal planning session to develop the scope and direction of its activities.

The committee heard presentations by two groups with interest in special aspects of subject heading work. First, Uhuru Funua, representing the Black Caucus, gave the views of that organization on the appropriate changes to be made in the Library of Congress subject headings now using the word "Negro." In a discussion with the committee, it was decided to recommend to the Library of Congress that the term "Afro-Americans" replace "Negroes,"

which stands for the black people of the United States, and that the term "Blacks" subdivided locally be used in place of *Negroes in Brazil [etc.]* for the rest of the world. The term Afro-Americans for blacks in the United States represents a preference expressed in polls conducted by *Jet* and *Ebony* and parallels the use of such formulations as Japanese-Americans and Mexican-Americans for other ethnic minorities in this country. "Black race" should be substituted for "Negro race." Mr. Blume agreed that the recommendation would probably be implemented at the Library of Congress as presented. Next, Joan Marshall, speaking for the Committee on Sexist Subject Headings of the Social Responsibilities Round Table/Task Force on Women, presented "Guidelines for Subject Headings," which advances four principles for the formulation of subject headings which designate peoples or groups of persons: (1) the authentic, that is, self-preferred, name of a group should be established if determinable; (2) subdivisions (for example, . . . problems") which imply inferiority or pecularity should be avoided; (3) headings for minority groups should not differ in structure from headings for the majority; and (4) subsuming terminology should not be used (for example, "general" should not subsume "male" if "female" calls for a special subject heading). After discussion among committee members and guests, the committee drew up and accepted a recommendation to the Library of Congress and other libraries that these principles be followed wherever practical in establishing and updating subject headings falling within the categories defined. [*Edward J. Blume*]

ISAD/LED EDUCATION FOR INFORMATION SCIENCE AND AUTOMATION COMMITTEE

This ISAD/LED joint committee held a meeting on July 1 on the topic "Development of Instructional Modules for Information Science." An instructional module was defined as a self-contained, possibly multimedia method of instruction of library school students in a limited part of a unit of a course in the library school curriculum. It provides self-paced, independent study for the student, involving active participation by the student with feedback from the module.

The program began with a demonstration of a module for preparing instructional modules, developed by Donald P. Ely at Syracuse University. The audience participated by completing the module's workbook during an accelerated audio-visual presentation. The steps in developing instructional modules include stating the objectives of the module, defining the audience for which it is intended, developing suitable tests to be given before, during, and after use of the module, selecting appropriate media, preparing the script and materials, and testing and evaluating the module's effectiveness.

Two different instructional modules were then described. One was actually a six-module package developed by Gerald Jahoda at Florida State University to teach the process of answering reference questions. The module for teaching query negotiation in the reference interview was presented as an example of how a module works. These six modules will be made available to other library schools.

The second module described, developed at the University of Southern California, was intended to teach students how to draw flowcharts for manual operations. Tests conducted on students taught flowcharting by both the existing classroom and the instructional module methods showed that, if used over a long enough time to recover the high development costs, the module could be made cost effective and offer students a choice in the type of instruction available to them without decreasing, and possibly increasing, the effectiveness of such instruction.

[*Ralph R. Orlik*]

ISAD AUDIOVISUAL SECTION

Margaret Chisholm presided at the first program presented by the newly organized Audiovisual Section on Wednesday, July 2. Miss Chisholm gave a historical overview of factors which contributed toward the development of the establishment of the Audiovisual Section of ISAD, referring to its organizational meeting on July 1.

Alma Tillin and William Quinly, co-authors of the fourth edition of *Standards for Cataloging Nonprint Materials,* which will be published by the Association for Educational Communications and Technology in late summer, discussed the organization of their manual and the recommended rules of entry which have been prepared in conjunction with the revised Chapter 12 of the *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules,* and presented and explained illustrated catalog entries for various nonprint media.

During the discussion which followed, Vivian Schrader traced briefly the history of the development of cataloging rules at the Library of Congress since 1946, the role of the Library of Congress in developing a draft revision of Chapter 12 of the *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules,* the significance of the comments made by audiovisual specialists on the

drafts of the chapter, the final approval of the revised Chapter 12 by the ALA Catalog Code Revision Committee, and the anticipated publication of the chapter as a separate by ALA in the late summer.

[*Vivian L. Schrader*]

ISAD VIDEO AND CABLE COMMUNICATIONS SECTION

The subject of the first session of the Video Carousel held on Wednesday, July 2, was acquisition of video programs, which was presented by Ken Winslow, Associate Director of the Public Television Library, Washington, D.C.

After a brief discussion of standardization of formats, he described the sources of video programs and outlined the categories of programs available. He stated that programs can be obtained from national and local broadcast networks and from custom and speculative nonbroadcast sources. The kinds of programing were categorized as product television, which is entertaining and requires no interaction on the part of the viewer; process television, which includes programs which cause the viewer to get involved because of the subject matter; and tutorial television, requiring the viewer to be involved in a teaching program.

Mr. Winslow emphasized the importance of acquiring programs directly from the producers if at all possible and referred to a guide entitled *Video Program Source Guide for Librarians.* The compilation contained names and addresses of about 300 owners and distributors of video programs and included available formats, fee arrangements, clearances, and subject categories for each entry. The guide was compiled by Mr. Winslow and assembled by the California Video Resource Project for distribution to the audience.

[*Leola Decker*]

ISAD PROGRAM MEETING

The ISAD program on the technical implications of the NCLIS report, on July 2, presented a panel of four speakers, chaired by Linda Crismond, University of Southern California. Joseph Becker, member of the NCLIS, presented an overview of those aspects of the report that relate to technology. One of the objectives of the recommended national program is to "plan, develop and implement a nationwide network of library and information science." This involves the development of standards in areas of computer technology, communications, reprography, and micrographics, as well as bibliographic standards. The development and implementation of centralized bibliographic services, of distributed computer processing services, and of new forms of communication are other requirements for a national network.

Following the overview, Martha Williams of the University of Illinois presented a paper on machine-readable data bases. Allen Veaner of Stanford University reviewed the status and future prospects of microform technology and standards. Philip Long, of Philip Long Associates, substituting for Russell Shank, commented on the time and cost factors associated with the implementation of a telecommunications network. As the last speaker, Ralph Shoffner of Reingold Corp. reported on the results of a survey he had made of reactions to the NCLIS report.

[*Josephine S. Pulsifer*]

RASD COOPERATIVE REFERENCE SERVICES COMMITTEE

The Cooperative Reference Services Committee of the Reference and Adult Services Division of ALA met on July 2 at 2 p.m. in the San Francisco Auditorium. The main item on the agenda was discussion of a proposed directory of cooperative reference networks. Herbert Bloom, ALA Senior Editor, attended the meeting and reported on the ALA view of such a directory. In essence, the association feels the present directory has little sales advantage. Rather than listing cooperative services, he felt that a more marketable idea would be to determine "reference strengths" of networks and libraries. After considerable discussion of the problems associated with this kind of publication, the committee decided that it was not feasible to pursue it at this time.

In light of the interest shown in networks by the large attendance at the committee's program meeting, "Networks of Knowledge: Model Reference Cooperatives," held the previous day, the committee felt it might be useful to consider preparing some sort of guidelines for operating a successful cooperative service. Proposals concerning the format such an endeavor might take will be presented at the next meeting. In the meantime, the chairman will explore the possibility of expanding the committee membership.

[*Nancy E. Gwinn*]

RTSD SS/LARGE RESEARCH LIBRARIES DISCUSSION GROUP

The July 2 meeting, which was on the order of a business meeting, convened with the reading and acceptance of the minutes of the group's meeting at the ALA Midwinter Meeting. Discussion then moved to proposals of a previously appointed task force set up to address the problem of the group being too

large to be effective as a discussion group. The proposals were to (1) limit official membership to persons involved in serials; (2) create a "medium to large" discussion group for some of the current membership of the large research libraries discussion group; (3) break into smaller groups after beginning the meeting, reconvening for a summary conclusion; and (4) divide permanently according to interests, such as acquisitions, cataloging, and binding.

A discussion followed in which the group did not show a preference for any one proposal. The incoming chairman, Charlotte Hensley, reported that the RTSD Organization Committee recommended that the Serials Section Executive Committee plan the broad programs designed to inform conference attendees on developments in serials so that discussion groups could limit themselves to exchanges about matters of detail of interest to their membership, and that membership criteria be redefined. It was suggested from the floor that scheduling the large research libraries discussion group at the same time as the medium-sized research library group would provide some reduction in attendance. After further discussion, a motion to set up another task force to study the range of proposals suggested by the earlier task force, and the subsequent withdrawing of the motion, the group concluded that there was no realistic way to restrict attendance, especially since restriction was contrary to ALA policy. At various times during the meeting the need for elections was voiced. Nominations were accepted from the floor and the following persons were elected: Vice Chairman, and Chairman-elect, Elizabeth Crosby, Cornell University; Secretary, John James, University of Massachusetts.

Joseph W. Price, Library of Congress Serial Record Division, at the request of the chairman, gave an updating report on the CONSER project, and with the assistance of Mary Sauer, National Serials Data Project, and Dorothy Glasby, Head of the Cataloging Section of Serial Record Division, both of the Library of Congress, answered questions from the floor about CONSER, NSDP, ISDS, and cataloging practices. The meeting was concluded after Neal Edgar, Kent State University, gave a brief report on the deliberations of the Cataloging Code Revision Committee.

[*Joseph W. Price*]

RTSD SS POLICY AND RESEARCH COMMITTEE

A report by Walter J. Frazer, Assistant Professor at the Rutgers Graduate Library School, opened discussion on the desirability and characteristics of a proposed library school course on serials. Mr. Frazer mentioned various aspects of serials and serials publishing which are covered by existing library school courses but noted that these are seldom combined into a course on serials. The group acknowledged that the current interest and emphasis on serials warranted Policy and Research Committee action on proposing a course or courses for library schools to consider.

Mary E. Sauer reported on the deliberations of a newly established ANSI Z39 Committee on Serials Holdings Statements. This committee, chaired by Glynn Evans of the State University of New York, has met once to consider approaches to standarization in holdings statements, including the approach developed by the Holdings Statement Sub Group of the Ad Hoc Discussion Group on Serials Data Bases, a precursor of the CONSER Project.

Other matters discussed without resolution included the threat of loss of lower class mailing rates available to many publishers of serials, differential pricing, and the issue of whether in-demand, out-of-print serials could ever be considered in the public domain. [*Joseph W. Price*]

RTSD RS BOOKDEALER–LIBRARY RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Harriet K. Rebuldela of the University of Colorado convened the RTSD Resources Section Bookdealer-Library Relations Committee at 2 p.m. on Wednesday, July 2. Emery Koltay of the R. R. Bowker Co. distributed literature about and discussed the progress being made by publishers, wholesalers, retailers, and librarians in the use of the International Standard Book Number (ISBN). Publishers and wholesalers are increasingly citing the ISBN and Bowker hopes to publish an index arranged by ISBN. A test is also to be conducted on filling orders for approximately 500 new books to demonstrate the savings in handling and delivery time to libraries utilizing the ISBN on their order slips. The BDLR Committee enthusiastically endorsed the use of the ISBN and urged libraries to cite them on book orders. The adoption as an ANSI standard of the proposed standard library book order form was also endorsed by the committee. Shirley Lebo of the Library of Congress was commended for her draft leaflet, "What Shall I Do With My Old Books?" that is scheduled to be published by ALA early in 1976. Literature was also distributed announcing the first Annual Library Microform Conference to be held on October 9 and 10 in New York City. This conference is sponsored by the quarterly

Microform Review and by the BDLR and the Micropublishing Projects Committees of the Resources Section. Further information can be secured from Microform Review, Inc., P.O. Box 1297, Weston, Conn. 06880.

The draft of the *Guidelines for the Acquisition of Out-of-Print Materials* (the third in a series of Acquisitions Guidelines compiled by the BDLR Committee) is still being revised and, it is hoped, will be completed for approval at the Midwinter Meeting in Chicago. The outline of the *Guidelines for the Acquisition of Microforms* was approved and will be enlarged and circulated for further review by the committee. The questionable practice of several micropublishers offering microforms for sale to libraries of materials that have been previously filmed by libraries was discussed. Not only are the prices for these films frequently considerably higher than those quoted by the libraries that filmed the original material, but the films offered by these commercial firms may be of poorer quality since they may not be printed from camera negatives. The Committee Chairman will draft a press release to be issued by ALA to warn libraries considering the purchase of microforms to search reference tools and catalogs thoroughly to compare prices quoted by different sources for the same title and to determine the quality of the microform offered before issuing an order. Lawrence Robinson of the Library of Congress described the extent of searching and procedures employed by the Preservation Microfilming Office of the Library of Congress before a decision is made to purchase a microform or film a file of deteriorating materials for preservation purposes. The Committee also discussed informal guidelines for its own use to facilitate the processing of complaints received and to insure fair treatment of all parties concerned, as well as informal complaints regarding a recent journal article and a subscription agent that had been called to the attention of the Committee Inquiries will be made regarding the latter to try to determine if a serious problem exists that requires any action by this committee.

[*Robert C. Sullivan*]

RASD/RTSD/ASLA PUBLIC DOCUMENTS COMMITTEE

"Documents Centers and Networks" was the topic of the program meeting of the Public Documents Committee on Wednesday, July 2, at which Albert Halcli, of the Illinois State Library, presided. The first speaker, Bernard Fry, Dean of the Graduate Library School at Indiana University, developed his presentation around the concept of a national documents center or national depository agency, as proposed by the Ad Hoc Committee on the Depository Library System. Noting that this concept was also in line with the recommendations of the National Committee on Libraries and Information Science for a national locus of authority, Mr. Fry emphasized that a national center plan for documents would have to be compatible with the NCLIS plan for a nationwide organization of libraries. Because such a national agency would be called on to set standards, catalog documents, and play a key role in the bibliographical control of Government publications, it would be preferable to name it the national documents center rather than the national depository. In addition to the recommendations it has already formulated, the ad hoc committee, said Mr. Fry, should expand its plans to include provisions for documents at all levels—local, state, and international, instead of limiting itself to Federal Government publications. Consideration should also be given, for coordination into the ad hoc committee's overall plan, to the many Federal depository systems (for example, those for maps, patents, and the HUD, NASA, and—until recently—the AEC system) which lie outside the system administered by the Superintendent of Documents.

Mr. Fry stated his conviction that the Library of Congress should assume the responsibility for bringing "Government documents into the main stream of literature." Since the Library, according to the NCLIS plan, will be the capstone of the national bibliographical system and the center for cataloging, it would be the natural location for the national documents center.

Ray Boylan, Assistant Director of the Center for Research Libraries in Chicago, described the functions and procedures of CRL in general terms and stated that its only experience with Government publications is with state documents, which it has been collecting since it opened in 1952. It has also accepted the pre-1952 documents which member libraries have placed with it. CRL does not collect U.S. Government documents, except for microforms, and is not interested in U.S. depository publications. Although it could become a "national resource for accessibility" of the large collection of materials in its keeping, Mr. Boylan did not feel that CRL was likely to become a national bibliographical center.

The Bibliographical Center for Research, as described by Donald Simpson, is a multi-state cooperative with nearly 700 members and users in the western states and the second oldest bibliographical

center in the country. Serving as an information "broker," it has a regional union catalog to which 125 institutions contribute, serves as an interlibrary loan clearinghouse, performs both manual and automated literature searches, participates in communications networking, and has publishing and training functions. In the documents area, it is concerned only with state and local documents, and is proposing a regional interstate compact to provide for the deposit in the center of state documents in hard copy or microform, and the preparation of a subject index to this collection. Mr. Simpson felt that, even if a national documents center is established, there is a place in the national scheme for such a regional program to assist in speeding up access to and delivery of publications to requesters. [*Nathan R. Einhorn*]

GODORT MICROFORMS TASK FORCE

The Microforms Task Force held its membership meeting on July 2 with George W. Stanberry, Geauga County Public Library, Chardon, Ohio, presiding.

LeRoy Schwartzkopf, Government Documents Librarian, University of Maryland, gave an extensive talk on "Retention Policy and Microforms." This was part of a survey of regional depository libraries for U.S. Government publications which he conducted recently.

James Livsey, Director, Library and Statutory Distribution Service, Government Printing Office, reported on a projected pilot program by GPO for the microfilming of the *Code of Federal Regulations*, which will be made available to depository libraries about August 15.

The new coordinator of the Microforms Task Force is Eris Roth, Social Security Administration Library, Baltimore, Md. [*George A. Shaw*]

LIBRARY RESEARCH ROUND TABLE

The Library Research Round Table held a program meeting on July 2 on "Advances in the Application of Statistical Methods in Library Research." The phrase "library mensuration" was proposed to describe the use of quantitative techniques to aid the decision-making processes in the management of libraries.

Three examples of such techniques were described. The first was an attempt by Charles Conaway of SUNY-Buffalo to establish a measure for the usability of the off-the-shelf indexes used in libraries. After defining terms such as "index usability" and "index usefulness," Mr. Conaway described his experimental method, by which he tested four variables contributing to the usability of an index: the cumulativeness of its coverage, the interpretability of the abbreviation schemes used, its quality of typography, and its "selfstandingness." He arrived at a single usability number for the 16 test indexes constructed for the experiment. He is now applying his techniques to off-the-shelf indexes.

Neal Kaski of the University of California at Berkeley described his model for estimating the amount of material missing from a library collection, outlined a procedure for assessing the status of a collection for missing materials, a procedure which included a sampling method and a strategy for searching for the sampled items, and commented on library security systems. Tests on two different academic library collections estimated that about 10 percent of the collections were stolen.

The third speaker, Bruce Miller of Northwestern University Library, described a two-stage sampling procedure used to estimate the proportions of lost books in a library collection. The two-stage method of sampling makes the initial choice of sample size, upon which confidence in the results of the sampling depends, less dependent on the true proportion of books list from the collection. A 3.5 percent annual book loss rate was estimated for the Northwestern University Library. This rate exceeded the exact 1.8 percent rate found for a subset of the total collection, leading to the conclusion that sampling inflates the real loss rate. [*Ralph R. Orlik*]

RTSD SS AACR REVISION STUDY COMMITTEE

The two meetings of the ad hoc committee on July 2 and July 3 were planned to duplicate each other and differed only in general discussion and questions from the floor. This report, therefore, summarizes both.

After introduction of AACR Revision Study Committee members (Richard Williams, New York Public Library; Margaret Johnson, University of California, Berkeley; Eleanor Hansen, Department of the Interior Library; Dorothy Glasby, Library of Congress) the chairman, Judith Cannan, Cornell University Libraries, opened the meeting by reading the charge which had been given to the committee by the Serials Section. The charge requires that the committee not only react to decisions made by RTSD's Catalog Code Revision Committee but also attempt to gather information and opinions to convey to that committee for use in their deliberations concerning rule revision.

Miss Cannan then suggested that the persons

present would, no doubt, be interested in hearing that the Catalog Code Revision Committee had voted on July 1 to make title the main entry for all serials. The announcement provoked much discussion from the floor as various persons were concerned about the problems involved with title main entry as well as being unsure about methods which might be employed in constructing the title. They were, however, reminded that no final decisions had been made as the CCRC's vote merely represented the position of only one of the five groups who will be the "authors" of the second edition of the *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules.*

The discussion then turned to proposals which had been submitted to the International Federation of Library Associations for consideration when a meeting is held in the fall to prepare a final version of the ISBD-S (International Bibliographic Description for Serials). Miss Cannan reminded the group that the ISBD-S is not concerned with entry for serials but would have to be considered in formulating rules for description and that it does, also, go into the question of the construction (or determination) of the title.

Since the CCRC has not yet discussed Chapter 7 (rules for description of serials) of AACR, it was felt that there was still time to offer suggestions. A general discussion ensued, mostly concerned with the type and form of notes to be used for serials as well as such matters as whether serials (like multi-volume monographs) should be described from the first issue or from the latest issue in hand (which is the practice under the present AACR).

In closing Miss Cannan urged anyone who had comments about Chapter 7 to communicate with Neal Edgar, University Libraries, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio, 44242, as soon as possible as he is the head of the team of the CCRC which will be considering the rules for the description of serials at the committee's October meeting. [*Dorothy J. Glasby*]

ALA BOOKLIST OPEN FORUM

Librarians, reviewers, and publishers interested in *The Booklist* met on Thursday morning, July 3, for "an exchange" with its staff. Following a general discussion chaired by *Booklist* editor, Paul Brawley, the audience participated in discussion groups led by Dorothy Parr Snowden, Associate Editor, and Helen Freiser, Editor, Books for Adults; Barbara Joyce Duree, Editor, Books for Young Adults; Betsy Hearne, Editor, Children's Books; Irene Wood, Editor, Non-print Materials Reviews; and Helen K. Wright, Editor, Reference and Subscription Books Reviews.

Prospective changes for Children's Books related to editorials, foreign-language lists (beginning in the fall with a Mexican-Spanish list), the listing of not recommended books, the reviewing of books of high interest and low vocabulary, and the initialing of reviews. [*Margaret N. Coughlan*]

HRLSD/AASL/CSD/YASD JOINT MEETING

A joint meeting of the Health and Rehabilitative Library Services Division, American Association of School Librarians, Children's Services Division, and Young Adult Services Division, on Thursday, July 3, was chaired by Margaret Cheeseman, Pennsylvania State Library, Harrisburg, Pa. The session began with an introduction by Ruth Velleman, Human Resource Center, Albertson, Long Island, N.Y., who was followed by Carolyn Vash, Chief Deputy Director of Vocational Rehabilitation, State of California, who spoke on "Legal Rights of Handicapped Young Adults" and Charles A. Watts, California Learning Resource Center, Los Angeles, Calif., on "Special Resources for Special Needs." Barbara Quarles, Phoenix (Ariz.) Public Library, talked on "Attitudes: The Patrons' View," and moderated a panel of handicapped young people who spoke freely about their reactions to the overly protective, frightened, or pitying attitudes encountered in their leading of ordinary lives. [*Margaret N. Coughlan*]

HRLSD BIBLIOTHERAPY COMMITTEE

The Bibliotherapy Committee of the Health and Rehabilitative Library Services Division held three meetings at the ALA Conference. Chairwoman Rhea Rubin, project director of the Cook County (Ill.) Corrections Library Project, opened the sessions by reporting on current activities of the committee. These included the completion of a bibliography on post-1970 bibliotherapy materials compiled by Clara Lack of the Santa Clara Public Library and Arleen Hynes of St. Elizabeths Hospital, Washington, D.C. Also, the formation of a clearinghouse for the distribution of bibliotherapy materials was approved.

Lesta Burt, Dean of the Library School at Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, discussed a survey she developed for the Bibliotherapy Committee. The purpose of the survey is to identify persons doing bibliotherapy, the processes used, and the collection of other information which will be helpful to ALA. The committee also decided to discuss the possibility of ALA certification for bibliotherapists at the next midwinter meeting in Chicago. In the interim, committee members were asked to consider identi-

fying those qualifications and skills necessary for certification. [*Marcie Rickun*]

LIBRARY MATERIALS PRICE INDEX COMMITTEE/OFFICE FOR RESEARCH JOINT MEETING

On Thursday, July 3, Frederick C. Lynden of Stanford University chaired a program meeting attended by approximately 200 ALA members that was jointly sponsored by the RTSD Resources Section Library Materials Price Index Committee and the ALA Office for Research. The basis for the program, organized by Paul Birkel of the University of San Francisco, Chairman of the LMPI Committee, and Barbara Slanker, Director of the ALA Office for Research, was the article by John P. Dessauer on "Library Acquisitions: A Look into the Future" that appeared in the June 16 issue of *Publishers Weekly*. The reactor panel assembled to discuss Mr. Dessauer's projections consisted of Helen W. Tuttle of Princeton University, Hugh Atkinson of Ohio State University, Hendrik Edelman of Cornell University, and this writer.

Copies of Mr. Dessauer's article, composed mainly of eight statistical tables, were distributed to those attending. Mr. Dessauer described the background of the study, the methodology employed, and the highlights of his findings. The research was undertaken at the recommendation of Leonard Schwartz of the Baker and Taylor Co. who is keenly aware of the scarcity of hard data about the library market and the book industry's need for planning guidelines. Baker and Taylor arranged for a grant to *PW* to engage Mr. Dessauer to do the necessary research. He utilized the limited published sources available that are cited in the article (consisting mainly of statistics for fiscal 1973 acquisitions by libraries) and supplemented this information with interviews with authorities in the library field, government, and industry, as well as assistance from various individuals listed in the acknowledgements at the end of the article.

Mr. Dessauer estimated that expenditures for library materials, which exceeded $1 billion in 1974, will reach nearly $1.5 billion by 1979 and that domestically published books, representing over $400 million of the 1974 total, will reach approximately $565 million in 1979. He felt, however, that the share of expenditures for domestic books will decline during the intervening years, and the number of units of library materials will fall drastically behind that of dollars spent because of the current wave of inflation. The projections also indicated to Mr. Dessauer that school and, to a lesser extent, academic libraries will be hard hit by budget cuts between 1975 and 1977, while public and special libraries will weather the recession rather well. The author predicted that an encouraging general recovery in the field will become noticeable by 1978. Mr. Dessauer acknowledged the incompleteness of the statistics that were available to him, especially for special libraries; he cited the twin challenges in formulating his projections through fiscal 1979 as the difficulties in predicting inflationary trends and estimating the size of future library budgets. In his opinion, inflation in the cost of library materials, which ranged between 10 and 20 percent in fiscal 1975, will moderate to between 6 and 7 percent in future years. He emphasized that unit prices cited are estimated list prices and therefore subject to discounts and recognized the trend toward publishing more materials in journal rather than book format. He felt that whereas academic libraries will suffer budget cuts along with those of their parent institutions, and therefore will experience a loss in both dollars available as well as units purchased, public and special libraries will be less affected; school libraries will suffer the most largely because of an approximate 7 percent per year decline in enrollment.

The panel members expressed varying degrees of reservations about the validity of the statistical tables compiled by Mr. Dessauer. Mrs. Tuttle referred to the discrepancies between the average prices of U.S. hardcover trade-technical books, U.S. periodicals, and U.S. serial services compiled by consultants to the LMPI Committee and published yearly in *The Bowker Annual*, and the average book and periodical prices cited in Mr. Dessauer's tables. Mrs. Tuttle particularly questioned why Mr. Dessauer used a range of $65 to $121 for the average annual cost of periodical titles purchased by college and university libraries for fiscal years 1973 through 1979, when the published indexes indicate that the present average cost is closer to $35; Mr. Dessauer responded that he favored the "average weighted price per title" approach utilized by Frank Clasquin, Vice President of the F. W. Faxon Co., Inc., as explained in the article "Periodical Prices: A Three-Year Comparative Study" published in the October 1, 1974 issue of *Library Journal*. Mr. Clasquin added a "popularity" factor to Faxon's data to arrive at a "weighted price" since many libraries do not purchase all of the titles in the data base and others purchase multiple subscriptions. The difference in philosophy did not completely answer the "$65 question" but it illustrated the divergence of opinion, not only on the projections but on

the validity of the fiscal 1973 base year figures.

This writer emphasized the importance of recognizing that Mr. Dessauer's tables are estimates or projections for library acquisitions for the fiscal years 1974 through 1979, compiled in fiscal 1975, based largely on incomplete data available for fiscal 1973; and also, that the reactor panel, which had access to the data for fewer than 10 days, could not hope to question many specific figures in the mass of data presented, but would be limited to interrogating the compiler to understand more fully his methodology and procedures. The projections were likened to "whistling in the dark" and this writer admitted to the compelling desire to whistle along with the author to believe that "inflationary pressures will begin to ease in 1976" and that we can look forward to "a general recovery in this field by 1978." Librarians in the audience were reminded that the statistics that they maintain in their own libraries on purchases of library materials are the most valid basis for projecting future acquisitions and costs, and that price indexes or projections such as those provided by Mr. Dessauer must be modified and tailored to fit the needs and activities of each library.

Hugh Atkinson expressed general agreement with the projections for units to be acquired by academic libraries but serious doubt that the budgets of public libraries would fare so well or recover from present budget reductions as promptly as projected by the tables. He also felt that there would be a reduction, because of increased selectivity by U.S. libraries, in acquiring foreign imprints and that therefore the purchases of imports would be less than those projected. Mr. Atkinson's view was that increasing pressures from students, faculty, and trustees for the purchase of larger quantities of domestically produced instruction-related books will demand larger portions of academic library budgets in the future, which will in turn reduce the funds available for building research-oriented collections and for purchasing competing forms of library materials.

Hendrik Edelman reiterated the importance of recognizing that the statistics presented were largely projections based on the incomplete and uneven data available. He emphasized that librarians must exercise caution in attempting to utilize these figures for budget estimates or justifications in their own libraries. The various hypotheses incorporated into these projections may or may not prove to have been valid and the data should not be cited as factual. While the accuracy of the total units projected for purchases by libraries may be proved by future experience, the subtotals for various forms of library materials and for various types of libraries will be subject to significant changes depending upon future shifts in the economy.

Mr. Dessauer in his remarks in response to the panel members commented that he felt as if he were defending himself against a dissertation committee. He stated his firm belief that, based on his research, although pessimism is easier to sell than optimism, he was well justified in the optimism reflected in his projections. He also reaffirmed his belief that, while library selection will become more intense in the face of continuing inflation and declining budgets, patrons will not allow library budgets to continue to be slashed much longer and "a new round of Federal support may therefore become available to libraries and schools by fiscal year 1979." A number of questions and comments were offered by members of the audience. A publisher's representative expressed alarm and questioned the projected decrease in units purchased (a 15.6 percent decrease in books purchased by academic libraries between fiscal 1973 and fiscal 1979) and asked whether Mr. Dessauer had correlated his statistics with the statistics available for growth in the gross national product (GNP). Mr. Dessauer assured his questioner that he had taken into account the GNP figures and that he stood by his projections. Another questioner expressed the opinion that the projections for the library purchases of audio-visual materials were too low and that increased prices in the future would demand greater selectivity by librarians.

The session concluded with the general feeling that only a similar ALA program in 1979 would settle the question of the accuracy of Mr. Dessauer's projections. There was unanimity, however, on the commendation due Mr. Dessauer for the service he rendered in publishing his article. It is hoped that this program will stimulate additional research and publication in the future in the area of book production, book prices, and library acquisitions where there is a dearth of currently published data.

[*Robert C. Sullivan*]

RTSD COMMERCIAL PROCESSING SERVICES COMMITTEE

In its July 3rd meeting, the committee discussed its ongoing project of developing a manual of guidelines and questions for use by libraries considering the use of commercial processing services.

The committee also considered the need for comments and suggestions from those in the library field

regarding such questions as how one decides when he should consider commercial processing services; if one decides on commercial processing services, how he identifies what organizations are offering commercial services; how one determines what service options are available and how to compare them; how processing specifications are negotiated and established with a vendor; what acquisitions services are available for processed books; what cataloging authorities are offered by the vendor; what methods of shipment, invoicing, reporting and handling of problems are offered by the vendor?

Dallas Shawkey, Chairman of the committee and Head of Technical Services at Brooklyn Public Library, expressed the hope that the manual would be based on many contributions from libraries with some experience in using commercial preprocessing services. [*David G. Remington*]

LIBRARY RESEARCH ROUND TABLE

The Library Research Round Table met Thursday July 3 with Barbara Nozik, School of Librarianship, University of California at Berkeley presiding. The theme was "New Directions in Library User Studies." Participants were George Whitlock on "The Patron of the First Regional Library of Mississippi," Douglas Zweizig on "Predicting Amount of Library Use," and Alice Ahlgren on "Project DIALIA."

Mr. Whitlock discussed a survey conducted in Mississippi to determine the amount of library use. The survey involved persons age 12 and over.

Mr. Zweizig's discussion was extracted from his doctoral dissertation. The information was obtained from a telephone interview with 460 respondents in Onandaga County, N.Y., in July 1972. The persons were asked, among other things, how often they had gone to the public library within the last year, how often they had phoned for information, and how often they had used the library for leisure reading.

Project DIALIB is a computer search service involving the libraries of San Mateo County, Santa Clara County, San Jose City and Redwood City. The patrons of this service are not the traditional public library users but are technology professionals, geologists, and college and university students. The libraries conduct two basic types of searches–(1) a custom search, a search as extensive as required to answer the patron's need; (2) a standard search, where patron is billed $5 and only one data base may be used. The project was inaugurated in 1974 and service for the first year was free. During the second year, the National Science Foundation will finance one-half the cost. [*Jewel Pettiford*]

Correction: In the American Library Association Appendix, p. A-147, that appeared in the July 25 *Bulletin*, the name of Virginia Boucher, University of Colorado was misspelled. The editors regret the error.

APPENDIX II

Vol. 34, No. 32 August 8, 1975

REPORT ON THE 68TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF LAW LIBRARIANS Los Angeles, Calif., June 23-25, 1975

At the first AALL business session, President Marian Boner, Librarian, Texas State Law Library, briefly discussed the overall state of affairs of the Association and advised all members interested in further details to consult the information published in the last issue of the Association's newsletter. Also noted were discussions and decisions made by the Executive Board in its meeting on Saturday, June 21.

The reading of the financial report revealed that the Association is in a better position than it was last year and indicated that the Association is operating on a sound financial basis. It was mentioned that a request will be made to the Council on Library Resources to consider continuing financial support for the AALL statistics project. The Statistics Committee will become a policy-making steering committee and Alfred J. Lewis, University of California at Davis, will act as Coordinator.

President Boner next discussed a policy statement on job security, remuneration, employment practices, and the pension plan of the administrative secretary at the headquarters office. Brief mention was made of the proposed constitutional amendments concerning the reorganization of the Association.

Following the President's report, Robert Kelly, Creighton University, Chairman of the Memorials Committee, read out the names of deceased members, a motion was made, voted upon and accepted to grant life membership to retired members, and the names of donors of scholarships and foreign guests attending the 68th Annual AALL meeting were announced. [*Zuhair E. Jwaideh*]

A symposium was held on the theme "Mexican Law for Norteamericanos," with Earl Weisbaum, Foreign Law Librarian, Los Angeles County Law Library, as chairman on Monday afternoon, June 23. At this panel two attorneys from the United States and two from Mexico spoke on various areas of Mexican law.

First to speak was Victor A. Vilaplana, now of the San Diego law firm of Gray, Cary, Ames & Frye. Mr. Vilaplana, whose experience includes a period of association with the Sepulveda Law Office in Mexico City, gave an overview of the legal system and courts of Mexico. Licenciado Manuel Lizardi, now Vice President and Secretary of the Banco Nacional de México in Mexico City and responsible for the Bank's legal department, discussed the corporation law of Mexico.

Licenciado Fernando Cervantes Conde, who serves as a partner in charge of the Tijuana Office of the law firm of Ignacio A. Guajardo, addressed himself to "The Notary Public and Civil Registers in Mexico," taking care to distinguish the former from the position of notary public in the United States, with which the quasi-governmental notary public in the Mexican system is often confused. The final speaker, Robert L. Miller of the Los Angeles law firm of Miller and Miller, discussed "Mexican Law for the Tourist," presenting a potpourri of information about Mexican law aimed at the potential visitor.

Following the presentations, the audience questioned the speakers. The program for the session included a useful bibliography on Mexican law intended to assist the attorney/law librarian who on occasion needs material on Mexican law.

[*Tao-tai Hsia*]

At the opening luncheon, President Boner introduced the guests seated at the head table, including Terry Hatter, the guest speaker filling in for Los Angeles Mayor Tom Bradley. Mr. Hatter, Professor at Loyola University Law School, welcomed the members to the city of Los Angeles and extended Mayor Bradley's regrets. Mr. Hatter ended his brief remarks with several humorous stories about lawyers and law librarians. At the end of the luncheon, President Bonner praised the chairman for the local arrangements.

[*Zuhair E. Jwaideh*]

The Workshop on Government Documents met on Monday evening. The moderator was Sandi Traicoff of De Paul University Law Library.

The speakers during Part I of the Workshop were Fred Emory of the Office of the Federal Register and Jim Livsey, Director of Depository Library Programs, U.S. Government Printing Office. Mr. Emory began by describing the new service at the Federal Register whereby one may telephone (202) 523-5022 and hear a recording of the highlights of information that will appear in the following day's issue of the *Federal Register*. Other developments at the Office of Federal

Register include: (1) current consideration of an "agency day" assignment for publication in the *Federal Register;* (2) identification of "inflation impact" statements as they appear in Government regulations, to be highlighted in the *Federal Register*; (3) form revision of agency regulations to provide the who, what, when and where of the regulation in the opening paragraph; and (4) a study by the Administrative Conference of the United States to determine what material belongs in the *Federal Register* and what does not. Mr. Livsey mentioned the new GPO Microform Program in which 24 libraries around the country will receive the *Code of Federal Regulations* on microfilm. The libraries which use the CFR microfilm will then provide input to GPO on the quality of the indexing.

Part II of the Workshop consisted of a review of the major publications of three Government agencies that one might expect to find in a law library, followed by a presentation on foreign commercial codes.

Publications of the Federal Trade Commission were discussed by Steve Margeton of Steptoe and Johnson, Washington, D.C. Materials published by the FTC which are collected by most law libraries are: (1) *Rules of Practice,* (2) *Foreign Trade Series,* (3) *Digest of Decisions,* (4) *FTC List of Publications,* (5) *FTC Decisions,* (6) *Advisory Opinion Digest,* (7) *Organization, Procedures and Rules,* and (8) *FTC Report on Mergers and Acquisitions.* The major private publishers of FTC materials are Commerce Clearing House and the Bureau of National Affairs. An important treatise on the FTC is Gerard C. Henderson's *Federal Trade Commission; A Study in Administrative Law and Procedure,* a 1924 publication reissued in 1968 by Agathon Press. For a legislative history of the FTC one should consult Bernard Schwartz's *Economic Regulation of United States Business and Industry; A Legislative History of United States Regulatory Agencies* (1973).

Publications relating to the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission were discussed by Ellen P. Mahar of Shea & Gardner, Washington, D.C. She traced the legislative history of the Commission beginning with the Securities and Exchange Commission Act of 1934. Important publications issued by the Commission are: (1) *Decisions,* (2) *Directory of Companies Filing Under The SEC Act of 1934,* (3) *Annual Report to Congress,* (4) *Rules and Regulations,* and (5) *Index to Commission Decisions.* Important commercial publications are: (1) *Federal Securities Law Reporter* (CCH), (2) *Disclosure Journal,* and (3) *The Services at the Washington Service Bureau.*

The Federal Power Commission was discussed by Catherine A. Porter of Vinson, Elkins, Searls, Connally & Smith of Houston, Tex. The FPC was authorized by two major acts, the Federal Power Act of 1935 and the National Gas Act of 1938. Official publications of the agency expected to be found in a law library are FPC (1) *Reports,* (2) *Opinions,* (3) *Decisions,* and (4) *Orders.* The only commercial publication which is certified by the FPC is the *Federal Power Service* published by Matthew Bender. Other commercial publications include the *Public Utilities Reporter, Federal Utilities Reports Annotated, Utilities Law Report, FPC Gas Docket,* and the *Natural Gas Reporter.*

Thomas H. Reynolds of the Law Library, University of California at Berkeley School of Law, spoke on foreign commercial codes. His coverage was world wide in scope but limited to those codes in English or English translation. The two most important publications for a law library are: (1) *Digest of Commercial Laws of the World,* and (2) *Commercial Law Series,* published by the Foreign Tax Law Association.

[*Michael C. McGoings*]

Law Library Service to Prisoners was the topic of a workshop also held on Monday evening. The moderator, Judy Foust, Pennsylvania State Law Library, introduced the speakers. Sally Barrows of Bucks County Law Library discussed the cooperation between public libraries and law libraries for prisons. She suggested that law librarians investigate the possibility of cooperating with other libraries in the geographic area and make oneself known to the public librarians. Further, she suggested enlisting the support of the community in establishing law libraries for prisons. Miss Barrows also pointed out particular problems with setting up prison law libraries, including maintenance costs, selection, expansion, staff and training, donations, access and circulation control, and photocopying services.

The second speaker was Barrett Wilkins, Assistant Librarian, State of Florida Library, who discussed what public libraries do for prisoners. Mr. Wilkins stated that public libraries initially became involved with prisons in the 1880's with a resurgence of involvement in the 1960's. He discussed some prison programs that have been publicized such as the Chicago Public and the Cook County system serving some 4,000 inmates. Other successful systems have been found in Columbia, Mo., San Antonio, Tex., Denver, Colo., and Brooklyn, N.Y.

The final speaker was Helen Carter from the University of New Mexico Law School library who

discussed her experiences over the last 10 years in providing library service to New Mexico prisons. She gave a detailed account of setting up photocopying and legal research services in her library. The cost to her library was measured in terms of 15 hours per week of student time plus up to two hours per week of her time. This time was expended in answering four to five reference letters per week which could also involve photocopying of cases. Prison funds were provided to the library for copying costs.

A lengthy question and answer period followed.

[*Marlene C. McGuirl*]

The second business meeting on Tuesday morning considered five items. The first was an AALL constitutional amendment to the last sentence of Article V, Section 1, removing the clause allowing a salary to be paid to the secretary and treasurer but rendered obsolete with the establishment of a headquarters office. Morris L. Cohen, Law Librarian, Harvard Law School Library, reported on the plans for next year's institute on American legal history to be held following the 69th Annual Meeting at Harvard. He also reviewed the new program being worked on by the Committee on Education and the various needs of the Association continuing education program. Julius J. Marke, Librarian, New York University Law Library, and the Association representative on copyright, reported on the status of the copyright law revision and its implications for library photocopying.

The last two items, the proposed policy statement on job security, remuneration, and employment practices received approval as did the new AALL chapter for the greater St. Louis area and called the Mid-American Association of Law Libraries.

[*Carleton W. Kenyon*]

A panel on legal bibliography, "From Nutshells to Automation," with Shirley R. Bysiewicz as moderator, was held on Tuesday morning, June 24. The first speaker, David Bryant, an attorney from Chicago, Ill., discussed paralegal training including various teaching techniques which he has used. Role playing as a method of explaining the enactment of a Federal law as well as the procedures during a trial has been effectively used.

Mr. Bryant explained that he emphasizes that the most important reference tool to a paralegal is the telephone and knowing who to call for a variety of information. Another important aspect of reference work for the paralegal is a discussion of sources for factual type of information. Speaking the language of the law is also important for the layman and the use of acronyms are encouraged to acquaint students with their use. Mr. Bryant also suggested that instructors always grade assignments and return them promptly. In conclusion, the speaker reported on the results of a survey he recently made of library schools offering courses in Law Librarianship. Mr. Bryant discovered that the average class size was 15-35 students and an A-F grading system was predominately used. Most instructors develop their own work problems and a few use video-tapes and transparencies.

The next speaker, Janet Dolan, Librarian at the Joint Law Library, Minneapolis, discussed "In-Service Training and Continuing Legal Education" for lawyers in the law firm. Miss Dolan described techniques employed in her own library and explained current awareness programs which she has used. She suggested ideas such as selecting topics to provide subject lists of current information; keeping subject files for new publishers; newsletters which include annotated bibliographies of new materials, as well as the table of contents of new periodicals; displays which may include demonstrations of new loose-leaf services available by the publishers; and displays of books on approval for lawyers to examine. The speaker also described structured continuing education programs for new library personnel, summer clerks, and legal secretaries. These programs ranged from orientation to the library to instruction in proper citing and a legal writing review.

The Lexis system of automated information retrieval was discussed by the third panel participant, Bardi Wolf, Law Librarian, Cleveland Marshall College of Law. He pointed out that because of the increase in the sheer volume of law in the United States—three million court decisions, growing by 50,000 per year, and one million statutes, increasing by 60,000 per year—manual searching requires more effort and time than ever before. The Lexis system is on-line, full-text retrieval. It is a system which retrieves legal information on command but does not evaluate or analyze it. After a brief discussion of the history of Lexis, Mr. Wolfe explained the instructional techniques in this automated system used at Cleveland Marshall. Both classroom lectures and terminal demonstrations during which the student must operate the terminal under the instructor's direction are used. The course of instruction, using the *Lexis Primer* and *Deskbook*, is taught to freshmen as three hours of the three-credit-hour legal research course.

As a final speaker, Fred Tagg, Bureau of National Affairs, suggested to the assembly that the American Association of Law Libraries develop a model course in legal bibliography to be taught to lawyers and law students. [*Marlene C. McGuirl*]

The workshop on automation, moderated by Bernard Reams, Washington University Law Library, surveyed the new trends in law libraries, the role of automated research, and the scientific and technological equipment available. Various speakers discussed steps to consider in selecting an on-line, machine-searching research system; the LITE Air Force data bases and retrieval system; the U.S. Department of Justice JURIS automated legal research system; Auto-Cite used by Lawyers Co-op as an editorial verification tool; the full-text and abstract on-line natural language search system operated by the West Publishing Company; and the experience in using the State of Iowa automated project at Drake University. Finally, a panel of law firm librarians gave their experiences in the use of Lexis.

[*Carleton W. Kenyon*]

The State, Court, County, and Bar Law Libraries Workshop met on June 24. The moderator was William J. Powers of the Cook County Law Library, Chicago, Ill. He introduced Lt. Col. Rose Volino, USAF/JASEL, Denver, Colo., who described LITE, a computer-based legal reference service which provides searches for the U.S. Department of Defense and any other libraries requesting their services. Information concerning the service and search requests may be called in to the service center at (303) 825-1161, ext. 6433. There is also a LITE newsletter available free of charge.

The remainder of the Workshop was devoted to a general exchange of ideas on new developments, information, and common problems.

[*Michael C. McGoings*]

The final business meeting of AALL was held on Wednesday morning with Marian Boner presiding. Before the meeting were the recommendations of the Task Force on Reorganization. As presented in the final report of the Task Force in May of this year, the first recommendation called for the establishment of three divisions within the AALL to represent three types of law libraries (academic; county, bar, and government; and private law libraries). In its second recommendation the Task Force urged the adoption of a means whereby special interest sections could be created when desired by a sufficient number of members with a common concern. It was envisioned that such special interest sections in some instances would supplant present committees and in others exist concurrent to the committee structure.

After Task Force Chairman J. Myron Jacobstein reviewed the activities of the group during the past year and its recommendations, various members responded to the recommendations. Following this debate, a straw vote was taken to obtain the reactions of the audience to the proposals for disclosure to the general membership. In this test vote, the first recommendation, which would involve the amendment of Article 7 of the AALL Constitution to allow the establishment of the three divisions, was rejected and the proposal that provision be made for the creation of special interest sections, which would involve the amendment of Article 8, was accepted. A final mail ballot of the general membership will be conducted later this year. This meeting concluded the official business of the AALL for the year. [*Tao-tai Hsia*]

The panel on "What Lies Ahead on Legal Subject Headings" which met after the business meeting was moderated by Peter Enyingi of the Los Angeles County Law Library. After a brief reference to the problem of rapid expansion of legal subject headings and the obsolescence of many of them affecting the use of Law Library catalogs, Mr. Enyingi introduced the panelists, Edward G. Blume, Chief, Subject Cataloging Division, Library of Congress; Morris Cohen, Law Librarian, Harvard Law School; and Jack S. Ellenberger, Librarian, Covington & Burling, Washington, D.C.

After a brief outline of the law collections of the Library of Congress and a report to the audience on the progress of Class K, Mr. Blume addressed himself to the topic of the panel. He stated that the Library's legal subject headings are integral parts of the more universal listing used for the general collection. The continuing expansion of legislative interest and intervention from a narrow legal political focus through the social, economic, and technical realms is reflected in the overwhelming diversity of topics which must now be incorporated into the list of legal subject headings. Changes are also taking place in the philosophy with which subject headings are approached. The rather simplistic assignments made in the past, based on brief terms, subdivisions thereof, etc., are now clearly oriented to conform with those assignments by using the vernacular so that the naive reader or searcher will find what he wants at the first access point.

The Library of Congress has, nevertheless, reconsidered the question of what really is a more accessible language and concluded that some degree of inversion, subdivision, and other "unnatural" devices would continue to serve a useful purpose.

Mr. Blume then analyzed some aspects of the procedural complexities involved in LC subject headings. Editorial organization is in progress to produce a

radical restructuring of subject headings for the Library's 9th edition. It is not altogether clear what the cost of this decision may be, he said, in funds needed and work time borrowed from other priorities. Furthermore, other libraries do not appear to be very eager to have such radical revision because of the possibility of severe repercussions upon their own catalogs. These reasons and others of lesser relevance made the Library readjust its objectives in this area. The project now maintains the existing system with an element of flexibility to accommodate change where needed but excludes any major alterations. Consequently, not very significant changes should be anticipated for legal subject headings. There is, however, the intention to be more rigorous in separating the legal from the nonlegal material under a given heading. As a result, increased usage of law and legislation in headings applicable to two fields is likely to be the more noticeable addition. Mr. Blume invited the library community to think of and actively contribute to the solutions of some of the problems in this area. Finally, he expressed his hopes that LC automation will be a positive contribution to the effective dissemination of both bibliographic records and authority files.

Mr. Cohen stated that despite the concern shown by academic law libraries, a superficial survey made at Harvard indicated that there is little change in the scheme of topics for writings by contemporary authors. He submitted, however, that if changes in subject headings become a more serious concern, librarians should remember that decisions in this area must invariably take into consideration the related searching elements. Mr. Cohen concluded his presentation by suggesting that new terminology should be immediately incorporated to insure access to the newly-acquired material. Any given scheme of subject headings should, therefore, be as well balanced as the legal system itself; that is, it should include elements of stability and continuity as well as sufficient flexibility to absorb changes without major alterations.

He also stated that a relatively small number of law libraries are willing to use LC subject headings without major changes. The rest believe them sufficiently inadequate to necessitate the development of their own listings. Nevertheless, he said, cooperation under the leadership of the Library of Congress was desirable in this area, especially for libraries with holdings of more than 50,000 volumes. This cooperation should consist of more than uncoordinated correspondence with individual members of the Association. The need for uniform listings is obvious and some form of concerted effort should be undertaken without delay unless the membership is prepared to accept some form of technological solution.

Mr. Ellenberger presented the problem of headings as viewed and solved by a small specialized law library such as that of a law firm. He submitted that there is no need for a law library of minimal size to adopt listings of large libraries. There are a number of listings available out of which the specialized librarian may choose based on his library's special interests.

He warned the membership about the problem of contracting the services of commercial legal information systems now available in the market. These systems are expanding their schemes to the point that they can be understood and successfully applied only by themselves rather than by the consumer. Librarians of law firms should not simply become instruments of these services but rather strive for active participation in their development if any adherence to these services is to be expected.

The audience showed concern in regard to the procedural aspects of the transition from obsolete to new headings. [*Rubens Medina*]

During the closing banquet the new officers of the Association were installed. They are: Jane Hammond, Villanova, President; Jack Ellenberger, Covington & Burling, Washington, D.C., Vice President/President-elect; Eugene Wypyski, Hofstra University, Treasurer; Patricia Piper, University of California at Davis, Secretary; and the two new Executive Board members, Leah Chanin, Mercer University, and Richard Sloane, University of Pennsylvania.

[*Marlene C. McGuirl*]